

PAST PERFORMANCE

To PCOs, ACOs, CORs

As part of the evaluation for solicitation N00167-02-R-0085, you are requested to provide information on past performance of the contractor (offeror) based on your knowledge of the work.

Please complete the evaluation as soon as practical and return to Mr. Roger N. Branstiter, FAX-301-227-1583.

Contract Number: _____ Agency: _____

Contractor Name: _____

Procuring Contracting Officer: _____ Phone: _____

Administrative Contracting Officer: _____ Phone: _____

Technical Customer: _____ Phone: _____

Program/Nature of Effort: _____

Performance Period: _____

A. Experience Manufacturing Model Scale Ship Related Hardware

Score

What are the indications for experiences with offeror's ability to manufacture model scale ship related hardware?

- (1) Marginal: Needs constant govt. oversight, resists suggestions.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Cooperative when confronted, responds well to issues.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Initiates feedback and seeks to improve.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Provided a very good product, very cooperative.
- (5) Superior: Provided an outstanding product, no customer complaints.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

B. Manufacturing Complexity of References/Previous Work

Score

What are the indications for experiences with offeror's ability to manufacture complex hardware, based on such features as overlap, NC machine set-ups, complex shapes. etc?

- (1) Marginal: Needs constant govt. oversight, resists suggestions.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Cooperative when confronted, responds well to issues.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Initiates feedback and seeks to improve.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Provided a very good product, very cooperative.
- (5) Superior: Provided an outstanding product, no customer complaints.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

C. Customer Satisfaction

Score

What are the indications for experiences with offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction? Are they responsive to customer needs and interact and cooperate well with customer personnel? Do they interact well with the subcontractor to meet schedule and quality?

- (1) Marginal: Needs constant govt. oversight, resists suggestions.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Cooperative when confronted, responds well to issues.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Initiates feedback and seeks to improve.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Provided very good service, very cooperative.
- (5) Superior: Provided outstanding service, no customer complaints.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

D. Quality of Performance

Score

What are the indications regarding the quality of the contractor's product (or performance) in terms of what the customer expected prior to award versus actual performance? Does the contractor provide high standards of workmanship and live up to their promises and commitments?

- (1) Marginal: Needs frequent oversight, occasionally missed schedules.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Needs some oversight, rarely missed schedules.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Carried out the assigned tasks with some problems.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Fully carried out the assigned tasks with few problems.
- (5) Superior: Fully carried out the assigned tasks with no problems.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

E. Schedule Adherence

Score

Are performance schedules adhered to? Does the contractor act to avoid potential problems that would effect timely performance/delivery or did they perform ahead of schedule? This includes proper management of subcontractor performance to avoid schedule delays.

- (1) Marginal: Has trouble meeting the Government's schedule, does not improve with time and experience, usually confrontational when pressured.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Generally always met the required schedule, had some minor problems that affected on the customer's schedule, strives to exceed, improves with and each task.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Usually always met the required schedule, had some minor problems with no affect on the customer's schedule.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Almost always met the required schedule, had some very minor problems with no affect on the customer's schedule.
- (5) Superior: Fully met the required schedule.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

F. Cost Control

Score

Does the contractor have good cost control and estimating measures in place. Do they provide advanced notification of potential cost growths? Do they aggressively act to control costs including closely monitoring subcontractor costs?

- (1) Marginal: No cost control mechanisms in place, frequent cost growths with no advanced notification.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Works at controlling costs, occasional cost growths.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Generally controls costs, has some rare problems.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Controls costs.
- (3) Superior: Acts aggressively to control costs.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.

G. Contract Compliance

Score

What are the indications regarding contract terms and conditions being strictly adhered to? Does the contractor provide timely notifications IAW the terms of the contract? Did the contractor utilize Small Business Concerns?

- (1) Marginal: Needs constant oversight.
- (2) Average/Acceptable: Usually is in compliance.
- (3) Good/Satisfactory: Generally is in compliance.
- (4) Highly Satisfactory: Mostly complied with all terms and conditions of the contract.
- (5) Superior: Fully complied with all terms and conditions of the contract.

Please provide remarks to amplify the evaluation. If unable to evaluate, please indicate why.